

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings; objects to the specification; objects to the claims due to minor informalities; rejects claims 1, 3-8, 20, and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by MOLES et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,024,557); and rejects claims 2 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MOLES et al. in view of BIMS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,911). Applicants respectfully traverse these objections and rejections¹.

By way of the present amendment, Applicants cancel claims 9-19 and 28-33 without prejudice or disclaimer and amend the drawings, specification, and claims 1-8 and 20-27 to improve form. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 1-8 and 20-27 remain pending.

Fig. 6B has been objected to as including references signs not mentioned in the description. Applicants propose amending Fig. 6B as suggested by the Examiner and as shown in the attached Replacement Sheet to correct the reference signs in accordance with the specification. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The specification has been objected to because of minor informalities. Applicants have amended the specification to correct the minor informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine reference, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 20, 21, and 25-27 have been objected to because of minor informalities. Applicants have amended these claims to correct the minor informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-8, 20, and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by MOLES et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features in Applicants' claims 1, 3-8, 20, and 22-27.

For example, amended claim 1 recites a method for secure message reception from a plurality of remote devices. The method includes receiving a message at a controller; obtaining, by the controller, a reverse channel address associated with the received message; determining, by the controller, whether the received message is associated with at least one of the remote devices; forwarding the message and the reverse channel address to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of the remote devices; determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address; and routing the received message to the destination address. MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest determining, by a controller, whether a received message is associated with at least one of a plurality of remote devices and forwarding the message to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of the remote devices. The Examiner relies on column 8, lines 7-11 of MOLES et al. as

allegedly disclosing these features (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of MOLES et al.

At column 8, lines 7-11, MOLES et al. discloses verifying whether or not a mobile station that is accessing a base station has been previously authenticated by a wireless network. This section of MOLES discloses determining if a mobile station has been authenticated, not determining, by a controller, whether a received message is associated with at least one of a plurality of remote devices and forwarding the message to a routing server when the message is associated with the at least one of the remote devices, as recited in amended claim 1.

MOLES et al. further does not disclose or suggest determining, by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address associated with the received message. The Examiner relies on column 9, lines 37-43 of MOLES et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of MOLES et al.

At column 9, lines 37-43, MOLES et al. discloses:

Memory 410 provides storage for data and programs associated with provisioning security controller 265 and encryption application program 415. Incoming IP data packets consist of an IP header, which contains the destination address of the target device to which the IP data packet is being sent, and an IP payload, which contains the user data and/or commands that are being sent to the target device.

This section of MOLES et al. discloses that incoming IP data packets consist of an IP header, which contains the destination address of the target device to which the IP data packet is being sent. MOLES et al. further discloses that a data processor stores the IP header information in an IP header field (column 9, lines 43-47). This section of MOLES does not mention a routing server. Instead, this section of MOLES et al. merely discloses that a data processor stores header information. Therefore, this section of MOLES et al. does not disclose or suggest determining,

by the routing server, a destination address for the received message based on the reverse channel address associated with the received message, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by MOLES et al.

Claims 3-8 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 3-8 are not anticipated by MOLES et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by MOLES et al.

For example, claim 6 recites determining whether the received message is associated with a remote device that is associated with a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server. The Examiner relies on column 9, lines 49-52 of MOLES et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 5). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of MOLES et al.

At column 9, lines 49-52, MOLES et al. discloses that a data processor encrypts the original data in an IP packet payload field according to an encryption algorithm and stores the encrypted data in an encrypted payload field. This section of MOLES et al. does not mention a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server. Therefore, this section of MOLES et al. cannot disclose or suggest determining whether the received message is associated with a remote device that is associated with a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server, as recited in claim 6.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 6 is not anticipated by MOLES et al.

Independent claim 20 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 20 is not anticipated by MOLES et al. for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 22-27 depend from claim 20. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by MOLES et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by MOLES et al.

For example, claim 25 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 6. Therefore, claim 25 is not anticipated by MOLES et al. for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

Claims 2 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over MOLES et al. in view of BIMS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and claim 21 depends from claim 20. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 21, Applicants submit that the disclosure of BIMS et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of MOLES et al. set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 20. Therefore, claims 2 and 21 are patentable over MOLES et al and BIMS et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60112/
Meagan S. Walling
Reg. No. 60,112

Attachment: Replacement Sheet for Fig. 6B

Date: December 20, 2007
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 25537